REMARKS

In the Office Action[1], the Examiner rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,223 B1 to "*Hughes*" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,479 to "*Chang*" and U.S. Patent No. 6,195,094 to "*Celebiler*."

By this response, Applicants amend claims 1-3, 13-15, and 25-27. Support for the amendments can be found at, for example, paragraphs 072 and 080 of Applicants' specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-36 remain pending.

Rejection of Claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. No *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must, among other things, determine the scope and content of the prior art and ascertain the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2144.08(II)(A), 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (September 2007). Furthermore, the Examiner must make findings with respect to all of the claim limitations and must make "some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness."
See M.P.E.P. §§ 2143.03 and 2141(III).

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a "computer-implemented method for providing a user-interface, the method comprising:

> providing an application for displaying a data object and for
> receiving and interrogating user input comprising a selection
> of the data object within a pattern based user interface;

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statement reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

providing within the application a non-pattern based user interface, in response to interrogating the received user input, at least for displaying sub-object attribute data of the data object; . . .

wherein the pattern based user interface and the non-pattern based user interface are displayed in frames in a side-by-side relationship, and

wherein the pattern based user interface provides general information of the data object and the non-pattern based user interface provides detail information of the data object in the form of the sub-object attribute data."

The Examiner alleges that *Hughes* teaches a "menu tool bar 701 [that] follow[s] a pattern" and a "source code display area 702, 703 and 1701 hav[ing] different patterns." *Emphasis omitted,* Office Action, page 3. However, these portions of Hughes fail to constitute or suggest at least the recited portions of amended claim 1.

The remarks on pages 10-13 of the Amendment filed June 17, 2008 explained the deficiencies of *Hughes*, *Chang*, and *Celebiler*. Applicants further explain the following additional deficiencies. In particular, Applicants point out that the menu tool bar and source code display areas of *Hughes* fail to teach or suggest selecting a "data object" where "the pattern based user interface provides general information of the data object and the non-pattern based user interface provides detail information of the data object in the form of the sub-object attribute data," as claimed. That is, the "menu tool bar" of *Hughes* does not constitute the claimed "data object" nor the claimed "general information." Therefore, any "activation" occurring at the menu tool bar, as shown in Figures 9 and 10 of *Hughes*, does not "provide[ ] detail information of the data object in the form of the sub-object attribute data," as recited in independent claim 1.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that loading source code into a code inspection tool, as shown in Figures 11-13 of *Hughes*, can be considered a form of "selection," which Applicants do not concede, the "menu displays" of Figures 12 and 13 fail to constitute or suggest an "application for displaying a data object and for receiving and interrogating user input comprising a selection of the data object within a pattern based user interface" configured so that "the pattern based user interface and the non-pattern based user interface are displayed in frames in a side-by-side relationship," as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action next asserts that *Chang* discloses "resizing and repositioning of text to accommodate supporting annotations." Office Action, page 3. Even assuming these assertions are true, which Applicants do not concede, *Chang* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Hughes*. That is, *Chang* fails to teach a "data object" where "the pattern based user interface provides general information of the data object and the non-pattern based user interface provides detail information of the data object in the form of the sub-object attribute data," as claimed. *Chang* also fails to teach "the pattern based user interface and the non-pattern based user interface are displayed in frames in a side-by-side relationship," as claimed.

The Office Action asserts that *Celebiler* discloses "displaying of user interfaces in frames in a side-by-side relationship." Office Action, page 3. Even assuming these assertions are true, which Applicants do not concede, *Celebiler* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Hughes* and *Chang*. That is, *Celebiler* also fails to teach a "data object" where "the pattern based user interface provides general information of the data object and the non-pattern based user interface provides detail information of the data object

in the form of the sub-object attribute data," as claimed. *Celebiler* also fails to teach "the pattern based user interface and the non-pattern based user interface are displayed in frames in a side-by-side relationship," as claimed.

As explained above, and contrary to the statements in the Office Action, the elements of independent claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. In view of the mischaracterizations of the cited references, the Office Action has neither properly determined the scope and content of the prior art nor properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and the claim. Moreover, the Office Action has not explained how one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention could modify the cited references to achieve Applicants' claimed combination. Accordingly, no reason has been clearly articulated as to why the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of the prior art. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 13 and 25, though of different scope from claim 1, recite elements similar to those set forth above for claim 1. Claims 13 and 25 are therefore allowable over *Hughes*, *Chang*, and *Celebiler* for at least the reasons presented above. Claims 2-12, 14-24 and 26-36 are also allowable at least due to their respective dependence from the independent claims. As such, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
    GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

/Krystyna Colantoni/
Dated: January 2, 2009   By:_____
                                    Krystyna Colantoni
                                    Reg. No. 60,226